

Appl. No. 10/715,752  
Docket No. CM2543CQ  
Amdt. dated January 14, 2010  
Reply to Office Action mailed on November 23, 2009  
Customer No. 27752

## REMARKS

### Claim Status

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-10, 13 and 14 are pending in the present application. No additional claims fee is believed to be due.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the feature of applying an active material to a surface of a first tool in the form of a multitude of endless beads. Support for this amendment is found at page 9, lines 21 – 24.

It is believed these changes do not involve any introduction of new matter. Consequently, entry of these changes is believed to be in order and is respectfully requested.

### Interview Summary

Applicants' attorney would like to thank Examiner Mazumdar for the courtesy of a telephone interview on January 13, 2010. During the interview, Examiner Mazumdar and Applicants' attorney discussed the rejections of claim 1 under 35 USC §112, first and second paragraphs. The Office Action took issue with the term "essentially unbroken lines" as recited in claim 1 of the present application. Applicants' attorney pointed out that the "essentially unbroken lines" recited in claim 1 are ubiquitously referred to as "beads" in common parlance, and that "beads" are disclosed in Applicants' specification. Applicants' attorney asserted that one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly recognize that these terms are interchangeable. In support of this position, Applicants attorney offered the analogies of "beads" of caulk and weld "beads." Examiner Mazumdar pointed out that the specification provided support for "endless beads" and suggested that Applicants amend claim 1 to replace limitation of "essentially unbroken lines" with "endless beads." In view of the interview and the discussions held therein, Applicants respond below to the rejections raised by the Office.

Appl. No. 10/715,752  
Docket No. CM2543CQ  
Amdt. dated January 14, 2010  
Reply to Office Action mailed on November 23, 2009  
Customer No. 27752

**Rejection Under 35 USC §112, First and Second Paragraphs**

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-10, 13 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement, and under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

The Office Action asserts that the specification does not teach applying adhesive in the form of a multitude of “essentially unbroken lines,” and that the specification and references to the drawing figures refer to the applied adhesive as “beads.” (The Office Action, page 2). The Office Action also asserts that by looking at figures 1 and 1B, it is unclear as to what a “multitude of essentially unbroken lines of adhesive” means. (*Id.*).

Claim 1 has been amended to replace the term “essentially unbroken lines” with the term “endless beads” as suggested by the Examiner. In view of this amendment, it is Applicants’ position that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs is moot.

**Conclusion**

This response represents an earnest effort to place the present application in proper form and to distinguish the invention as claimed from the applied reference(s). In view of the foregoing, entry of the amendment(s) presented herein, reconsideration of this application, and allowance of the pending claim(s) are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By

  
John G. Powell

Registration No. 57,927  
(513) 983-0523

Date: January 14, 2010  
Customer No. 27752